

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4556	COUNTY	Alpine
APPLICANT	Alpine County	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$156,250
PROJECT TITLE	Alpine Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$198,578

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Complete an Integrated Water Management Plan for Alpine County encompassing the headwaters of the Carson River, Mokelumne River, and Stanislaus River.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: The work plan includes a short list of tasks appropriate to accomplish the objectives of the proposal but is lacking in any detail and background documentation. Deliverables are provided. It is unknown whether the budget is reasonable since there is no backup documentation to reflect how the cost estimates were put together.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant includes good descriptions of: geography, environment, impaired waters, examples of reasons for certain water quality problems, proposed IRWM Group, and the reason for proposed boundaries. They also describe benefits from watershed management within the proposed boundaries as opposed to current watershed management. The two maps do not provide much detail. The proposal lacks information on water uses, environment, community, etc. The applicant states, "Alpine County encompasses portions of the headwaters of five major rivers; Carson, Stanislaus, Mokelumne, American, and Truckee".

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The potential Alpine IRWM group is not a team yet. Alpine County proposes objectives hoping the potential IRWM group will concur. The objectives need more explanation and description of how they were determined.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal lists some water management strategies from individual groups but the strategies of the applicant are unclear. Two good examples of opportunities to integrate strategies are included, but more information on how the strategies will be integrated is needed. Coordination appears to be lacking. The applicant does not address how coordination will begin; since this has not been accomplished they have not developed common goals or strategies.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The IRWMP relies on adaptive management with the Alpine Watershed Coordinator to assist partners with individual projects, with Alpine County potentially adopting the IRWMP once it is finished (thus becoming responsible for monitoring implementation). More details showing how this will work need to be included. The applicant states that individual agencies will be responsible for the development and implementation of projects.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal includes adequate analysis of potential benefits of developing the proposed IRWMP. It also describes potential impacts of not developing the IRWMP. By using adaptive management with County oversight, it includes a means to evaluate and address potential impacts as the IRWMP is implemented. However, the impacts and benefits are only loosely defined. The applicant does not say they will be analyzing the benefits and impacts as part of the IRWMP, and CEQA issues are not stated. The applicant states that the region would benefit from communication and cooperation between local agencies, but how specifically is unclear.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant lists 21 previous studies dating back to 1978. The applicant does not state what data is available from these reports and how they will benefit the proposed IRWMP. No technical studies to support the proposed planning are mentioned.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The proposal describes a process to gather, manage and disseminate information from developing and implementing the IRWMP. However, it does not specifically demonstrate how it will support statewide data needs. The applicant states that data will eventually be accessible on the world wide web.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant identifies a process for stakeholder development in the proposal including water-related entities and appropriate stakeholders as well as a process to identify and include additional stakeholders. Stakeholder meetings will use a facilitator to help ensure all interests are represented. It appears that all or most appropriate stakeholders are involved. However, environmental justice concerns are not addressed.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The applicant states that there are no DACs within the geographic scope of the IRWMP. There was no census or socio-economic data analysis or a narrative discussing these characteristics.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal lists several local planning documents that could form the foundation for the IRWMP. The proposal does not describe how the local plans will relate to the IRWMP or address dynamics between the two levels of planning documents. It is not clear how the local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWMP.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant does not state how it will coordinate with local, state and federal agencies. Local, State and federal partners are listed on the potential list of stakeholders. The applicant states that the county will serve as the umbrella agency for purpose of coordinating the IRWMP and a consultant will gather and involve the stakeholders. How they will be brought into the planning process is unclear.

TOTAL SCORE: 41